

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 14, and 16-35 are pending in the present Application. The Examiner's action dated September 21, 2005, has been received, and its contents carefully noted. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to the title and suggested a new title. This requirement is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8, 14 and 16 relate to a travel direction device and claim 17-35 relate to a travel direction warning device. Accordingly, the existing title is believed to be appropriate. If this objection is maintained, the Examiner is requested to contact undersigned to advance prosecution.

Claims 29-35 were rejected due to a number of informalities. The Examiner's suggestions have been taken. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly being based on a non-enabling disclosure. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the recitation that travel direction data relative to the traveling route having been traveled in the past is read out from a memory means and the frequency of the traveling direction is obtained. This language makes clear how the

notification of direction is given in the way reflected in claim 1. This change to the claim is supported on, for example, page 28-29 of the present Application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 16, 17, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being a single means claim. Additional means have been added to these claims to overcome this rejection. Withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 7, and 18-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims to overcome this rejection. Withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly incomplete. Claim 4 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 28-30 and 34-35 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. These claims have been amended to overcome this rejection. Withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 14 and 16-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Urano (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,898). Claims 28-30, 34-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Okuda (U.S. Patent No.

6,262,657). Claims 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Urano in view of Okuda. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a travel direction device in which a direction about a traveling route is set, traveling direction data relative to the traveling route having been traveled in the past is read out from a memory means and frequency of the traveling direction is obtained, a notification of the direction is given less frequently than a number of times a car has driven the traveling route if the car has driven the traveling route a plurality of times. This is not taught or disclosed by the prior art of record.

The Office Action asserts that Urano discloses a travel direction device similar to that specified in claims 1-8. However, applicant respectfully submits that the invention of Urano relates to a navigation device in which the shape or density of objects displayed in the display device is changed in accordance with the driving or travel condition. In contrast, the travel direction device of the present invention includes the feature that the frequency (i.e., number of times) of the travel direction outputted to a display device or speaker device is changed. In particular, in accordance with claim 1, the notification of the direction is given less

frequently than the number of times the car has driven the traveling route if the car has driven it more than once. Urano contains no such disclosure.

For at least this reason, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-8 depend from and include the recitations of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable in and of themselves and as they depend from and include the recitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above. For the sake of brevity, applicant will not discuss each claim separately.

Claim 14 recites a travel direction device comprising a controlling means for setting a predetermined area centered about a school as a school zone and giving warnings about cautions for travel when a car drives roads in the set school zone based on school days information and school time information, and an output means for outputting the warnings from the controlling means. The controlling means changes contents of the warnings depending on school types, road types, isolation duration of the area, and vehicle speed. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

The Office Action asserts that Urano discloses the travel direction device as claimed in claim 14, and cites

Figures 1B, 8 and 12, and column 25, lines 15-19 and 34-36.

In Urano, in a navigation system to be installed in a car, the values of the factors defining the displaced styles of the objects are defined by function using the positional coordinates, presumably in the vehicle. The Urano device provides a time-basis visual appearance control applicable to traffic regulations on the roads within a school zone such that the speed limitations are valid only on school days. The different types of visual displays are shown in Figures 8A and 8B, and depend on the location of the vehicle and the time of day. In contrast, according to applicant's claimed invention, warnings are given when the vehicle drives roads in a set school zone and the control means changes contents of the warnings depending on the school type, road types, isolation, duration of area and vehicle speed. These types of parameters are not taught or disclosed by Urano. For this reason, applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 16 recites, a travel direction device comprising a controlling means for setting a predetermined area centered about a school as a school zone and giving warnings about cautions of travel when a car drives roads in the set school zone based on school days information and school time information, and an output means for outputting

the warnings from the controlling means. The controlling means sends a deceleration command signal to a control device of the car when the car drives through the school zone so as to reduce the speed. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

The Office Action asserts that Urano discloses the device claimed in claim 16 and cites again Figures 1B, 8 and 12, and column 25, lines 15-19 and 34-62. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Urano, including the cited sections, does not disclose sending a deceleration command signal to a control device of a car when the car drives through a school zone so as to reduce the speed. Urano only discloses changing the style of the display depending on the time and position of the vehicle. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 17 recites a travel direction warning device comprising a continuous driving detection means for detecting a continuous driving condition of a car by comparing the driving condition of the car with a pre-set reference value of the driving condition, and a voice output means for outputting a voice warning when the continuous driving is detected by the continuous driving detection means. The voice output means changes expressions of the voice warnings, age and sex of the

voice, depending on time zone, season, events or a number of times of travel. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

The Office Action asserts that claim 17 is taught by Urano and cites Figure 1, and particularly element 140, as the recited voice output means, and further cites to column 25, lines 15-62. No citation is given for the recitation of the claim "wherein the voice output means changes expressions of the voice warnings, age and sex of the voice, depending on the time zone, season, events or a number of times of travel." Applicant respectfully submits that no citation is given because none can be found. The reference is devoid of the teaching of a voice warning. It discloses only a display device for visually displaying symbols. The Urano patent discloses no warnings. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 18-27 depend from and include the recitations of claim 17. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable in and of themselves and as they depend from and include the recitations of claim 17, which is patentable for the reason discussed above.

Claim 28 recites a travel direction warning device, comprising a comparator means for comparing continuous driving

time or continuous traveling distance of a car with a pre-set reference value of the driving time or traveling distance, and a voice output means for outputting a voice warning when the driving time or continuous traveling distance of the car detected by the comparator means is over the pre-set reference value. The voice output means changes expressions of the voice warnings, age and sex of the voice, depending on time zone, season, events or a number of times of travel. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

The Examiner cites Okuda et al., abstract and column 8, lines 49-62, as allegedly teaching the claimed invention. However, no citation is provided for the voice output means changing expressions of the voice warnings, age and sex of the voice, depending on time zone, season, events or a number of times of travel, as is recited in claim 28. In fact, Okuda does not disclose or suggest this feature. In addition, the cited section of Okuda et al. does not disclose outputting for a comparator means for comparing continuous driving time or continuous traveling distance with a pre-set reference value. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 29 recites a travel direction warning device, comprising an unsafe driving detection means for detecting an unsafe driving condition by comparing the driving conditions of the car with a pre-set reference value for the unsafe driving condition, and a voice output means for outputting a voice warning when the unsafe driving condition is detected by the unsafe driving detection means. The voice output means changes expressions of the voice warnings, age and sex of the voice, depending on time zone, season, events or a number of times of travel. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

As discussed above with respect to claim 28, Okuda does not disclose a voice output means which changes expressions, age and sex of a voice, depending on the time zone or other parameters. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 30, 34 and 35 depend from and include the recitations of claim 29 and are believed to be patentable in and of themselves and as they depend from and include the recitations of claim 29 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 31-33 are also believed to be patentable in and of themselves and as they depend from and include the

recitations of claim 29. The teachings of Urano do not remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to the Okuda patent.

On page 8 of the Office Action the Examiner asserts that the "other limitations are not structural and it is believed that the device of the prior art can perform the limitations that are not related to structure." This statement is made with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Applicant respectfully notes that whether the device can perform the limitations is not the question. Without a specific teaching in the prior art to perform those particular limitations, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to do so without improper hindsight reference to Applicant's disclosure. Moreover, if the Examiner is suggesting that these features are inherent in the prior art device, Applicant respectfully disagrees. A feature is only inherent if it is always and necessarily present in that device. Clearly these limitations are such that they are not always and necessarily present.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and an early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

Appln. No. 10/078,271
Amd. dated January 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2005

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Ronni S. Jillions
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:dtb
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\K\Kanf\Takezaki1\PTO\AMD 23JAN06.doc